

President should both have in hand better information on the potential costs and benefits of unilateral sanctions proposals. And they should both proceed in a more deliberative and disciplined manner.

SANCTIONS REFORM ACT

The bill Congressman CRANE and I will introduce is a bill that seeks to accomplish these objectives. H.R. 2708 would reform the process by which both Congress and the executive branch consider unilateral sanctions proposals.

The bill defines a unilateral sanction as any restriction or condition on foreign economic activity that is imposed solely by the United States for reasons of foreign policy or national security.

For both Congress and the executive branch, the bill sets out guidelines for future sanctions proposals and procedures for their consideration and implementation.

The guidelines would be largely similar for both branches. We propose that sanctions bills approved by Congress and sanctions measures imposed by the President:

- Contain a 2-year sunset;
- Provide waiver authority for the President;
- Protect the sanctity of existing contracts;
- Be targeted as narrowly as possible on those responsible for sanctionable conduct;
- Minimize any interference with humanitarian work performed by nongovernmental organizations; and

Include measures to address any costs incurred by U.S. agricultural interests, which are especially vulnerable to foreign retaliation.

With the exception of this agriculture provision, all of the guidelines would be mandatory for the executive branch. But the President could waive several of them in the event of a national emergency.

The bill's procedural reforms for Congress would require a committee of primary jurisdiction to include in its report on a sanctions bill an analysis by the President of the bill's likely impact on a range of U.S. foreign policy, economic, and humanitarian interests. The committee would also need to explain in its report why it did not adhere to any of the sanctions guidelines.

By invoking the Unfunded Federal Mandates Act of 1995, the bill would also require a report by the Congressional Budget Office on a sanctions bill's likely economic impact on the U.S. private sector. Under the terms of the Unfunded Mandates Act, the bill could not be considered on the House or Senate floor until the CBO analysis was completed and made public.

With respect to the Executive Branch, the bill would require the President to report to Congress prior to implementation on the likely impact of a proposed measure on U.S. foreign policy, economic, and humanitarian interests. The President would also be required to consult with Congress and to provide opportunities for public comment. To provide time for this consultation, public comment, and reporting, a sanction could not be imposed—except in the event of a national emergency—until 60 days after the President has announced his intention to do so.

It is also important to understand what our bill would not do:

The bill would not prevent Congress or the President from imposing unilateral sanctions.

The bill would not impact any sanctions currently in effect. The bill's executive branch

guidelines and procedural requirements would apply, however, to future sanctions imposed by the President pursuant to existing laws.

The bill would impose no limitations on the foreign countries or conduct that could be targeted by sanctions.

The bill would have no impact on any of the following kinds of measures—now or in the future:

Sanctions imposed under any multilateral agreement to address a foreign policy or national security matter—including proliferation, human rights, and terrorism.

Restrictions or controls on the export of munitions.

Resolutions disapproving a Presidential decision to maintain MFN trade privileges for China or any other country.

Measures imposed under U.S. laws and regulations implementing trade agreements, combating unfair foreign trade practices, and safeguarding the domestic market.

Import restrictions designed to protect food safety or to prevent disruption of domestic agricultural markets.

Measures to implement international environmental agreements.

Import restrictions designed to protect public health and safety.

This bill is not a red light for sanctions. It is a flashing yellow light. Its message is to take a careful look around and proceed with caution.

I hope that Members who have supported sanctions in the past—as I have—would be able to support this bill. To oppose a measure like this is to say that Congress and the President can't use and shouldn't have better information about sanctions. That is a position neither we nor the President should take. We need not fear information.

This bill would require those who propose sanctions to work harder to justify their proposals. It would ensure that elected officials and the public are better informed about the potential consequences of a proposed measure. Sanctions that receive the kind of careful scrutiny this bill will require are bound to be more effective in achieving their aims and to cause less collateral damage to humanitarian and economic interests. Better-designed sanctions will also be more likely to retain public support.

ANN'S CAMPAIGN FOR A SAFER AMERICA

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 23, 1997

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the greatest nightmares that any family could experience is receiving a call in the middle of the night informing you that your daughter has been killed. Even worse to learn that she has been murdered by a random shooting clear across the country. That is the nightmare faced by Coleman and Jean Harris of Mount Vernon, VA, last spring when their daughter, Ann was murdered while visiting friends in Tacoma, WA. This bright and energetic honor student had a most promising future, having just gained early admission into Purdue University. While riding in a car on March 27, she was struck and killed by a bullet fired sense-

lessly into the car by a joyriding group of young men. All too often these incidents of random violence are happening across America, representative of a society that is becoming more and more numb to the violence occurring on our streets. All of us know that something must be done to develop in our young kids a better sense of values and a more fundamental respect for human life. Getting guns out of the schools is critically important, but we must go further to address the value structure that results in such a cavalier attitude about life among many young people today.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, of the campaign that has been launched by the Harris family—Ann's Campaign for a Safer America. This effort represents a wonderful attempt by a grieving family to use the tragedy of Ann's death as the impetus for action to stop youth violence. The Harris family is speaking out in schools and in many communities to bring this message of understanding and respect for others to young kids. This is an incremental effort, Mr. Speaker, reaching out in small ways to kids who need this message. If it reaches 50, 100 or 1,000 young people and helps them to care more for their fellow students, it will represent a very significant and meaningful accomplishment. If even one more tragedy such as Ann's senseless murder can be averted through the work of this campaign, it will be a remarkable success and a very important memorial to this very talented and inspiring young woman. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Coleman and Jean Harris and express my appreciation for their desire to turn Ann's tragedy into a positive and constructive educational effort.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, MEDICAL LIABILITY REFORM, AND EDUCATION REFORM ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1997

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2607) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes:

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Moran substitute to H.R. 2607, the Fiscal Year 1998 District of Columbia appropriations bill. Unamended, H.R. 2607 will provide \$7 million for a school voucher program that will enable only 2,000 of the District's 78,000 students to attend private schools or schools in the suburbs at the cost of \$3,200 each.

Vouchers will drain critical financial resources from the D.C. public schools. These schools—as are many schools across the Nation—are already overburdened with financial problems. We need to do all that we can to strengthen the D.C. Public School System, not weaken it. Over 5 years, the proposed voucher program will siphon \$45 million away from D.C. public schools while helping only 3 percent of the school population.